



OFFICE of the ATTORNEY GENERAL
GREG ABBOTT

February 13, 2003

Ms. Sara Hartin
Assistant City Attorney
City of Killeen
101 North College
Killeen, Texas 76541

OR2003-0971

Dear Ms. Hartin:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 176759.

The City of Killeen (the "city") received a written request for all records pertaining to barking dog complaints filed against the requestor. You indicate that some of the responsive information will be released to the requestor. You contend, however, that the remaining information coming within the scope of the request is excepted from required disclosure pursuant to sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code protects "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision," including information protected by the informer's privilege. *See generally* Open Records Decision No. 515 (1988). The common-law informer's privilege has long been recognized by Texas courts and is incorporated into the Public Information Act by section 552.101. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *see also Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided that the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer's privilege also protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." *See* Open Records Decision No. 279 at 2 (1981) (citing Wigmore, Evidence, § 2374, at 767 (McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute carrying a civil or criminal penalty. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4-5 (1988).

In this instance, you have demonstrated that the two "Voluntary Statements" provided to the city's animal control department pertain to alleged violations of a city ordinance that carries criminal penalties. Because the release of these two statements would reveal the identities of the complainants, we agree that the informer's privilege is applicable in this instance. The city therefore may withhold the two voluntary statements in their entirety pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer's privilege.¹

However, because the submitted "Calls for Service Reports" do not reveal the identities of the complainants, we must address the other exception you claim for these documents. You specifically contend that the "Calls for Service Reports" are excepted from public disclosure pursuant to section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code, which excepts from required public disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency . . . it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication." You represent that "no criminal charges have been filed against the Requestor concerning barking." We therefore agree that section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code is applicable in this instance.

Section 552.108 does not, however, except from required public disclosure "basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime." Gov't Code § 552.108(c). After reviewing the "Calls for Service Reports" you submitted to this office, we conclude that all of the information contained therein constitutes "basic information" for purposes of section 552.108(c). *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976). Accordingly, the city must release the submitted "Calls for Service Reports" in their entirety.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

¹Because we resolve this aspect of your request under section 552.101, we need not address the applicability of section 552.130 to these records.

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Vernon G. Schimmel
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

VGS/RWP/lmt

Ref: ID# 176759

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Ida Mancha
2808 Fish Pond Lane
Killeen, Texas 76542
(w/o enclosures)